F 1233
.M619
Copy 1

MEXICO

AND

THE UNITED STATES:

AN

American View of the Mexican Question

WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO THE

INTERESTS OF THE UNITED STATES.

BY A CITIZEN OF CALIFORNIA.

SAN FRANCISCO:
H. H. BANCROFT AND COMPANY.
1866.

MEXICO

AND

THE UNITED STATES:

AN

American View of the Mexican Question

WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO THE

INTERESTS OF THE UNITED STATES.

BY A CITIZEN OF CALIFORNIA.

SAN FRANCISCO:
H. H. BANCROFT AND COMPANY.
1866.

4-36301

Mexico and the United States:

AN AMERICAN VIEW OF THE MEXICAN QUESTION, WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO THE INTERESTS OF THE UNITED STATES.

During more than two centuries Mexico was ruled by Spain, and for the benefit of Spain exclusively. No foreign vessel was permitted to enter a Mexican port, and for a long time Cadiz and Manila had the exclusive privilege of sending vessels to Vera Cruz and Acapulco, the only two ports which then were open to trade. No foreigner could enter the country without special permission from the King. The Spanish Government not only required her colonies to obtain all their imports from Spain, but forbade the manufacture of many articles in Mexico. All these impediments, however, were overcome by the immense wealth of that privileged ground. The country began, in the latter half of the last century, to gain rapidly in population and business, and the prospect of its future progress went on brightening from year to year. The annual production of silver rose to $25,000,000, and there were one hundred and seventy births for one hundred deaths. All the branches of industry were being developed, and Spain, convinced of her past error, had relinquished and abrogated many of the restrictions which weighed over the native Mexicans, giving them ample scope to compete with the sons of the mother country; in fact, we may say that Mexico was then enjoying prosperity. The finances were in a flourishing condition, the revenue of the Government amounted to $20,500,000, whilst all the expenses of the administration were hardly $10,000,000, leav-

ing a balance of over $10,500,000, which was dedicated to the expenses of the Home Government—this, too, whilst the Colonial Government was obliged to sustain an army of 81,000 men. But there came a change over this peaceful state of affairs. The rebellion against the Spanish authority broke out in 1810, and was suppressed after nine years of civil war. In 1821 there was another rebellion, which, headed by Iturbide, was successful, and the colony of New Spain became the Empire of Mexico. With this change, the revenue came down as if by magic to $9,500,000, whilst the disbursements amounted to $14,000,000. The power of Spain once overthrown, the leading men, who were profoundly ignorant of the business in which they were engaged, and dazzled by the example of the American Union, undertook to establish a Federal Republic, consisting of a number of States, each of which styled itself "sovereign and independent." There were no officers familiar with the practice of such government, the people had no comprehension of their rights and duties; there was no well organized industry and commerce, with influence enough to maintain order, and there was not the popular education which is the only secure foundation for free institutions.

NO POPULAR ELECTIONS.

The result was political disorder, and a total disregard for individual as well as national rights. Then civil war, which became chronic, trained men to habits of rapine and murder, enabled them to commit crime with impunity by pretending to punish the enemies of the Government, and deprived the civil officers of authority and of the means of enforcing the laws. For forty years the Government was in name and in name alone a Republic. The use of that appellation was a false pretence, an abuse of language, an indication of what the best men of the country hoped to reach, but never succeeded in reaching. In no kingdom of Europe has monarchy or despotism ever produced such baneful results as have been produced in Mexico by anarchy during the last forty years. It is the theory and practice of American republicanism that the people select their rulers at brief intervals; it is the fact of Mexican history that not one ruler has ever been selected by the people. The army

has been the ruling power; its favorites have been the Presidents; its choice has been indicated not at the ballot box, but at the cannon's mouth. It was an army not made up of intelligent, reputable citizens, who volunteered from patriotic motives, who were well disciplined, well paid, faithful in their service and regardful of the property of their fellow citizens, but a band of pressed men, often drawn from the prison cells—the basest and most ignorant of the country, undisciplined, unpaid, ill dressed, supported by plunder, and always ready to desert to a hostile standard if better prospects, greater license or more booty are promised to them. Civil war prevailed almost without interruption, and with war went brigandism and lawlessness. The courts were almost powerless. The popular elections which were to be held, in theory, were never held in fact. Peaceable citizens had no voice in the selection of their rulers. The Presidents were nearly all Generals, who took office by usurpation, and held it by force. But as the elements of their support were made of the same material, the usurpers never had the power to maintain themselves. In less than a year, on an average, they were ejected to make room for somebody else.

LIST OF ADMINISTRATIONS.

In the forty years of so-called Republican Government, from 1823 to 1863, there were fifty-four different administrations, averaging eight months and twenty-seven days each. The following is a list of these administrations:

Executive Powers	Triumvirate { Bravo, Victoria, Negrete; }	April 1, 1823.
G. Victoria		October 1, 1824.
† V. Guerrero		April 1, 1829.
J. M Bocanegra		December 18, 1829.
The Triumvirate, Velez & Co		December 23, 1829.
A. Bustamente		June 1, 1830.
M. Muzquiz		August 18, 1832.
G. Pedraza		December 24, 1832.
Santa Anna		April 1, 1833.
V. Gomez Farias		May 17, 1833.
A. Santa Anna		October 27, 1833.
V. Gomez Farias		December 15, 1833.
A. Santa Anna		April 24, 1834.

* The * means that the President held power under a consolidated republic; the † indicates that the head of the administration had dictatorial powers.

U. Barragan.....January 28, 1835.
Jose J. Corro.....February 27, 1836.
*A Bustamente.....April 19, 1837.
*A. Santa Anna.....March 18, 1839.
*N. Bravo.....July 10, 1839.
*A. Bustamente.....July 17, 1839.
*S. Echeverria.....September 22, 1841.
†A. Santa Anna.....October 10, 1841.
†N. Bravo.....October 26, 1842.
†A. Santa Anna.....March 5, 1843.
†V. Canalizo.....October 4, 1843.
A. Santa Anna.....June 4, 1844.
V. Canalizo.....September 20, 1844.
*J. S. Herrera.....December 6, 1844.
*M. Paredes.....January 4, 1846.
*N. Bravo.....July 29, 1846.
M. Salas.....August 5, 1846.
V. Gomez Farias.....December 24, 1846.
A. Santa Anna.....March 21, 1847.
P. M. Anaya.....April 2, 1847.
A. Santa Anna.....May 20, 1847.
M. Peña y Peña.....September 26, 1847.
P. M. Anaya.....November 12, 1847.
M. Peña y Peña.....January 8, 1848.
J. Herrera.....June 3, 1848.
M. Arista.....January 15, 1851.
†J. B. Ceballos.....January 5, 1853.
†M. M. Lombardini.....February 7, 1853.
A. Santa Anna.....April 20, 1853.
M. Carrera.....August 15, 1855.
J. Alvarez.....October 4, 1855.
Ignacio Comonfort.....December 11, 1855.
Ignacio Comonfort.....December 1, 1857.
*Ignacio Comonfort.....December 17, 1857.
Benito Juarez.....January 14, 1858.
*F. Zuloaga.....January 23, 1858.
*M. Robles.....December 23, 1858.
*F. Zuloaga.....January 4, 1859.
*M Miramon.....January 13, 1859.
S. G. Ortega.....October 25, 1861.
Benito Juarez.....January 11, 1862.

LIST OF CONSTITUTIONS.

The following is a list of the various constitutions or declarations, altering or overthrowing constitutions, with the date and authorship of each:

Acta Constitutiva.....January 1, 1824....Congress.
Constitucion.....October 4, 1824....Congress.
Plan de Zavaleta.....December —, 1832.Santa Anna.
Ley Constitucional.....December 15, 1835.Congress.
Leyes Constitucionales.....December 29, 1836.Congress.
Bases de Tacubaya.....September 28, 1841.Santa Anna.
Plan of Huexotzingo.....December 11, 1842.Citizens of Huexotzingo.
Base de Organisacion.....June 12, 1843.....Junta de Notables.
Plan de San Luis.....December 14, 1845.M. Paredes.
Plan de Guadalajara.....May 20, 1846.....Garrison of Guadalajara.
Plan de Ciudadela.....August 4, 1846....Gen. Salas.
Acta de Reformas.....May 18, 1847.....Congress.

Plan de Jalisco	October 20, 1852	Garrison of Guadalajara.
Convenio de Arroyozarco	February 4, 1853	Gen. Uraga and Col. Robles.
Bases para la Administracion	April 22, 1853	Santa Anna.
Plan de Ayutla	March 1, 1854	Col. Villareal.
Plan de Ayutla Reformada	March 11, 1854	Ygnacio Comonfort.
Estatuto Organico	May 15, 1856	Ygnacio Comonfort.
Constitucion de 1857	February 5, 1857	Congress.
Plan de Tacubaya	December 17, 1857	Gen. Zuloaga.
Plan de Tacubaya Reformada	January 12, 1858	Gen. Parra.
Leyes de Reforma	——— —, 1859	Juarez and Cabinet.

This list shows that there have been twenty different changes, more or less radical, in the Constitution within forty years—one every alternate year on an average.

GOVERNORS AND CONGRESSMEN APPOINTED.

In the Governorships of the so-called States there was more stability, but not more republicanism than in the Presidency. No man has been strong enough to hold the latter more than three years since 1830, whereas the Governors usually have held power much longer—extending in some cases almost to life. Alvarez in Guerrero, Vega in Sinaloa, Gandara and Pesqueira in Sonora, and Vidaurri in Nuevo Leon, are examples. Men often obtained sufficient influence to control a State for a long period, but they failed if they attempted to control the whole country. The power of the Governors (like that of the Pashas of Turkey,) has not in any case been based on popular election. The chief military man in the State usually took the office; perhaps he would receive an appointment from the President, or perhaps disregard absolutely that formality.

There was a nominal Congress, composed of representatives of the States, but the Congressmen, instead of being *elected by the people*, were *appointed by the Governor*, or by the President. They were, therefore, invariably the mere tools of the latter, who always had at his command an army ready and willing to disperse his enemies, or silence his antagonists.

If the President did not like an Act of Congress no attention was paid to it. The judicial department of the Government occupied a very low position. Instead of being the guardian of the Constitution, the Supreme Court was the servant of the Executive. The spirit of constitutional liberty, the knowledge of constitutional rights and the sense of constitutional obligations, were lacking everywhere, and without these

republicanism is impossible in any case, time or place. And is it still to be maintained, with the facts before us, that Mexico is fit for a Republican Government?

SLOW INCREASE OF POPULATION.

It is but logical to presume that the results of such continuous turmoil have been most disastrous to the increase of population, particularly to the male portion, which forms the nucleus of strength in all countries. This assertion is fully carried out and sustained by the facts. In 1793, according to Humboldt, there were 5,270,000 Mexicans; in 1862, there were 8,465,000, showing a gain of 60 per cent; whereas the population of the United States advanced from 3,929,827 in 1790, to 31,443,332 in 1860—an increase of more than 700 per cent. It is a well known fact to all who have visited the country, that there are to-day extensive districts in which there are twice as many women as men, the latter having been killed in civil strife. Ruin and misery wherever the visitor turns his eye sustain the assertion.

EDUCATION.

Popular education and intelligence, which are the only secure basis for free institutions, are lacking in Mexico. In 1842, according to Brantz Mayer, only 687,000 out of 7,000,000 could read, or about one in ten, whereas of the native born Americans about 90 in 100 can read. In 1844, the children attending school in Mexico were one-thirty-seventh part of the population; in the United States, in 1860, they were one-fifth. In 1844, Mexico had forty-four periodicals, or six for a million of inhabitants, and in 1860 the American periodicals numbered 4,051, or 700 for a million. If we have given no statistics on Mexican education later than 1844, it is because we are unable to find any, nor do we think any could be found anywhere, but if there be any later they would surely not show any change of note for the better.

PRESENT INDUSTRY.

The industrial position of the country is very low. The only finished railroad worthy of mention is but twenty

miles long, and there is not one canal constructed since 1821. Wagon roads are few, and even those are of the remains of Spanish enterprise; wagons, except on routes between the principal cities, are rarely seen. Merchandise is transported chiefly on mule back, at great expense of money and time. The high cost of freight implies a very small consumption of foreign goods, and a small production of domestic articles for exportation. The majority of the people live in the rudest manner. Their houses are built of adobes or sticks; the roofs are made of thatch or tiles, and the earth serves as a floor. Glass windows, carpets, tables, chairs and bedsteads are the luxuries of the few. The wardrobe of the men is usually confined to a shirt, a pair of trowsers, a hat, a pair of sandals, and a zarape that serves as a cloak by day and as a blanket by night. The common dress of women of the lower classes is composed of a chemise and petticoat, and when they leave the house they wrap a couple of yards of cheap cloth round the head and shoulders as a *rebozo* or shawl. Altogether we can safely estimate that on an average the amount of all the expense for wearing apparel of the *pueblo* does not exceed $25 a year for one person.

GENERAL IDLENESS.

Idleness has become a prominent feature of the national character. It is not the result of the climate, for the richest and most populous portion of the country, though within the tropics, is cool, in consequence of high elevation above the sea. The summers are cooler and the winters are warmer in the cities of Mexico, Guanajuato and Zacatecas than in Philadelphia, Cincinnati and St. Louis. Idleness with the Mexicans is not the result of hereditary disposition, for the ancient Aztecs were an industrious people, and so are the poorer class of Spaniards in Spain. *It is the result of bad government, which left the people without education, made no roads, did not protect either life or property, gave no encouragement to industry, plundered the merchant and man of wealth and destroyed the force of public opinion and the sense of public justice.* In the United States, even among the poorest, a man must work and be as cleanly in his dress as his labors will permit, and keep within

bounds of propriety and virtue, or he is ostracised by common consent. In Mexico it is different. Idleness and depravity are not as a general rule under the ban of society. They have been made part of the customs of the country, not by natural inclination, but by a continuation of misrule. Let us not be misunderstood. We intend to throw no stigma or slander on the people; far from it, as we have in our own intercourse with them witnessed many a noble and generous trait of character, but how can it be otherwise when corruption is fostered by the leaders of the Government? When virtue is made to bow before the desires of any petty chieftain, and often to pay the ransom for an aged father or a brother? Such has been the case in many places within our observation, as for instance in Sinaloa, Guerrero and Jalisco. The *fact* exists, but the *causes* are to be assigned not to the *nature* of the people, but to the *influences* of the few.

COMMERCE.

Commerce cannot flourish without peace, security and industry, and as the last three are wanting in Mexico, so the first languishes. In all peaceful, civilized countries there is a regular increase of trade; in Mexico there is none, or so little that it scarcely deserves notice. Macgregor in his Commercial Statistics, published in 1850, says: "The commerce of Mexico has been diminishing for the last eighteen years." According to Humboldt, the annual imports of the country at the beginning of this century were $15,000,000, and the exports $22,000,000. Lerdo de Tejada reported that the imports in 1856 were $26,000,000, and the exports $28,000,000. These figures are larger than those given for later years by other authorities, but still they are far below what they should be if Mexico were completely civilized and prosperous. Half the value of the imports consists of cheap cotton and woolen cloths, for the simplest garments of 8,000,000 people, showing a very small consumption of those substances required in mechanics and manufactures. Of the exports, three-fourths are silver and the remaining one-fourth is made up almost exclusively of articles produced with little labor, and without any high mechanical skill. The official report on the Commerce

and Navigation of the United States shows that the chief imports from Mexico, in 1860, exclusive of precious metals, were the following :

Hides and Skins	$535,062
Animals	180,935
Cotton Goods	173,347
Dye Wood	161,115
Guano	115,369
Mahogany and other timber	111,780
Brown Sugar	55,233
Sarsaparilla	47,127
Cochineal	39,258
Straw Hats and Bonnets	26,894
Earthenware	26,455
Sisal Hemp	25,114
Salt	22,555
Vanilla Beans	20,738

The cotton goods in the above list were of European or American manufacture, and were reshipped because they were either unsuited to the market or a better price could be obtained elsewhere.

COMPARISON OF EXPORTS.

Let us now make a table of the exports of the leading civilized countries, and see how they compare with those of Mexico :

	Annual Export per person.	Total Annual Export.	Population.
California	$97 00	$44.000,000	450,000
Victoria	83 00	50,000,000	600,000
Great Britain	40 00	1,100,000,000	27,000,000
Cuba	16 00	25.000,000	1,500,000
United States	11 00	330,000,000	30,000,000
Chile	10 00	18.000,000	1,800,000
Belgium	9 00	40,000,000	4,300.000
France	8 00	297,000,000	35,000,000
Spain	9 00	120,000.000	14,000,000
Mexico	3 00	28,000,000	8,465,000

In this list California, Victoria, Cuba, Chile and Mexico hold a much higher position than those to which they are entitled as commercial countries. Most of their trade is foreign, while the internal trade of the chief commercial nations is proportionately much larger. Iron, coal, cotton, wool, hemp, lead, tobacco, rice, sugar, grain, and manufactures of various kinds, are each produced in the American Union by different districts, which then exchange their products with one another. And the same remark is true of France and Great Britain, but not of Mexico, which should be compared with countries which

produce the precious metals and import nearly all their iron, cotton, wool, and such manufactures as require the investment of much capital and the labor of a large number of skillful mechanics.

The annual exportation, exclusive of treasure, from Mexico, is $6,000,000; from California, $13,000,000.

The amount of exports from the United States, in 1863, to certain other countries, was as follows:

England	$160,056,956
British America	31,281,040
France	17,150,299
Cuba	15,053,293
Ireland	14,659,439
Mexico	9,072,212

The statistics of San Francisco contain the following figures for the tonnage of the vessels which arrived in 1865 from Vancouver Island and British Columbia, the Hawaiian Islands and Mexico, and the amount of money paid to them as freight on their cargoes:

	Tonnage Inward.	Freight.
Vancouver Island and British Columbia	46,125	$102.000
Hawaiian Islands	18,390	65,000
Mexico	26,323	24,200

These figures enable us to appreciate the industrial and commercial condition of Mexico. They, therefore, cannot but attract the especial attention of all whose interest may direct them to that heretofore distracted country. The exports consist chiefly of hides, dye wood, lumber, guano, and other articles which are produced without industry or labor. The annual exports amount to only $3 00 for each person, whilst they amount to $97 for each inhabitant in California, $83 in Victoria (Australia), $10 in Chile, $40 in Great Britain, $11 in the United States, and $8 in France, though the three last named countries have a large interior trade, whereas Mexico has not.

When we compare the annual exports, exclusive of treasure, from California and Mexico, we perceive that the former shows an average of $20 for each inhabitant, and the latter *less than* $1. The United States exports relatively five times more to England, seven times more to Cuba, and seven times more to Canada than to Mexico. Pacific British America has a popu-

lation of about 20,000, and the Hawaiian Kingdom of about 70,000, and yet each has more commerce with San Francisco *than Mexico, with all its millions.*

GREAT NATURAL RESOURCES.

Republican Mexico in the commercial world has been almost a desert; in the financial world, almost a nuisance. It offered little profit to trade, little security to capital. It did not contribute its share to the wealth of other nations, it did not protect the foreigner who visited its borders. And yet the country is peculiarly fitted by nature to grow rich. It has unsurpassed agricultural, commercial and mineral resources. It has all climates and all soils. No other land can produce cotton, rice, sugar, coffee, tobacco, wheat, maize, the apple, the grape, the orange, the olive and the banana with more advantage. No other country has a coast line so long absolutely and relatively to the total area. Two oceans bathe its shores, and the narrow territory in the southern portions offers peculiar facilities for an easy and quick transit between the Atlantic and the Pacific. There are excellent harbors and everything needed for the establishment of a most flourishing commerce, save the government, until now. But the chief wealth of Mexico lies in the silver mines, from which $2,500,000,000 have been taken, without exhausting them or even reducing the productive mineral resources. All authors of the best books that treat of mining in Mexico, agree that the silver yield would increase greatly if the mines were in possession of a nation capable of bringing them to the highest state of development. This assertion is fully sustained by the fact that even in the short space of a year since the interior States have been in peaceful possession of the Empire, we notice a rapid increase. For instance, according to the official reports published in Mexico, in 1865, three mints only, Mexico, Zacatecas and Guanajuato, coined during the year $13,696,000, whereas, we have seen that previously the whole export of the country, according to Lerdo de Tejada, did not exceed $22,000,000.

VAST MINERAL WEALTH.

Humboldt says he is "tempted to believe that Europeans have

scarcely begun to profit by the inexhaustible fund of wealth contained in the New World. Europe would be inundated with the precious metals if the deposits of ore at Bolanos, Batopilas, Sombrerete, Rosario, Pachuca, Moran, Zultepec, Chihuahua, and so many other places that enjoyed an ancient and just celebrity, were assailed at one and the same time with all the means offered by the perfection to which the art of the miner has attained." Duport says, "the deposits that have been worked for three centuries are nothing to those that remain to be explored. The time will come, a century sooner or a century later, when the production of silver will have no other limit than that imposed by the always augmenting decrease in its value."

The opinion of Ward is given in the following passages: "That the great mineral treasures of Mexico commence exactly at the point where Humboldt rightly states the labors of the Spaniards to have terminated (above latitude 24 degrees) is a fact now universally admitted by the native miners,' although hitherto but little known in Europe. (Vol. I, p. 127.)

"The States of Durango, Sonora, Chihuahua and Sinaloa contain an infinity of mines, hitherto but little known, but holding out, wherever they have been tried, a promise of riches superior to anything that Mexico has yet produced. * * * * In common, I believe with all those who have had an opportunity of inquiring into the resources of New Spain, I do regard it as so well ascertained a fact that her mineral riches are almost unexplored that I am willing to rest upon it my whole calculation with regard to her future importance as a country." (Ib. p. 160.)

Humboldt, Duport and Ward are the highest authorities, and have given us the best books on the mineral wealth of Mexico.

ONE STEP FROM INFANCY TO DECREPITUDE.

But natural resources, however rich, cannot be properly developed without peace, order, security, good roads, regular, cheap and speedy communication, and freedom from unwise restrictions. Unfortunately Mexico has been lacking in all these, and for the lack during the last half century the repub-

lican anarchy is chiefly responsible. Alaman, the ablest historian and statesman of Mexico, in his history of the country, says: "When we see this immense loss of territory within a few years [109,945 square leagues—more than half of the original area, which was 216,012 square leagues], this ruin of the public treasury leaving behind it a grievous debt, this destruction of a brave and well trained army, and above all, this total extinction of public spirit and of every idea of a national character—when we see a nation that has passed from infancy to decrepitude without having enjoyed the vigor of youth, or shown any signs of life save violent convulsions, it seems that we must admit, with the great Bolivar, that independence has been bought at the price of all the benefits possessed by Spanish America while in the colonial condition." (Historia, Vol. V, p. 904.)

MONARCHY THE ONLY HOPE.

The evil, however, was not in the independence but in the Federal Republicanism, for which the people were not fitted. All the wisest men of the country have long been hoping for the establishment of a monarchy. Presidents Herrera, Paredes, Santa Anna, Gen. Almonte, and Gutierrez Estrada all were in favor of a monarchy. Alaman, who was Minister of Foreign Relations under the Republican Government, and who, therefore, had strong motives for not speaking very directly against that form, says: "The conclusions drawn from the unquestionable facts, and having all the vigor and force of mathematical demonstrations, are these: that the political institutions of the nation are not those that are required for its prosperity." (Vol. V, p. 923.) Again he says: "There are many who despair of ever making a reform to satisfy those who consider it necessary. To cure the ills of the nation, we must not repeat those experiments which have heretofore been tried without success." (pp. 927–8.)

Gutierrez Estrada, one of the most eminent Mexicans, Senator and Minister of Foreign Affairs, after expressing his opinions in public debate, that the monarchical form of government, with a Prince of royal blood at its head, was the best adapted to the traditions, necessities and interests of the peo-

ple, thus said, in a letter written in 1840, to Gen. Bustamente, then President of Mexico : "After reviewing our past misfortunes, what does the future offer? I repeat that the moment has arrived in which the nation must turn its hopes towards the monarchical principle as the only means capable of bringing back to us the blessings of peace, for which we so ardently pray."

Thus both condemn a Central Republic, Federal Republic, and Dictatorship, and nothing remains but monarchy, which, as all wise men perceive, is the only salvation of the country. But there was no one in Mexico strong enough to hold the crown on his head, since, as Alaman says, "all public spirit and idea of national honor had been extinguished."

A MONARCH INVITED IN 1854.

A party, therefore, among the better and wealthier Mexicans were engaged for many years in efforts to establish a monarchy, with some European Prince upon the throne. This party was repeatedly in power, but some obstacle always stood in the way of the realization of their plans. The following document shows how far the party had advanced at one time :

"Antonio Lopez de Santa Anna, Major General, etc., etc., etc., and President of the Mexican Republic,

"Greeting : Whereas, I have been authorized by the Mexican nation to organize it under that form of government which I might believe best fitted to secure its territorial integrity and national independence in the most advantageous and stable manner, according to the absolute powers with which I am invested ; and, whereas, no government can be better suited to a nation than that to which it has been accustomed for centuries and under which it has formed its peculiar customs ;

"Therefore, and to attain that purpose, having confidence in the patriotism, the intelligence and the zeal of Señor Don José Maria Gutierrez de Estrada, I confer upon him by these presents the complete power needful, so that he may enter into arrangements with and make the proper proposals to the Courts of London, Paris, Madrid and Vienna, to obtain from all those governments, or from either of them, the establishment of a

monarchy in Mexico, derived from one of the royal families of those Courts, under the terms and conditions which may be established by special instructions.

"In faith of which I have issued these presents, signed by my hand, authorized by the seal of the nation, and countersigned by the Minister of Foreign Affairs, all under the proper reserve, in the National Palace of Mexico, on the 1st day of July, 1854.

A. L. de Santa Anna.

This commission was no doubt presented to the Courts of Britain, France, Spain and Austria, at the time, but for some reason nothing came of it. The monarchical party in Mexico accused Santa Anna of betraying them and of intending to put the crown on his own head, so he was allowed to fall. The commission, however, was never revoked, and Estrada did not neglect his duties. In October, 1861, he wrote to Santa Anna, then in the Island of St. Thomas, about the allied expedition to Mexico, and expressed a hope that the result would be the elevation of Maximilian to the throne. On the 30th of November of the same year, Santa Anna replied, saying that he was delighted with the prospect of the salvation of his country and that there could be no better choice than that of Maximilian.

These facts show that the establishment of an Empire, with Maximilian at the head of it, is not a new idea with the Mexicans, and that it was fully authorized twelve years ago by the head of the Mexican Government, and at that time *full notice was given to the Government of the United States of the intended change.*

When Juarez was driven from the capital, the Mexican monarchists and representatives of the different States, convened in full assembly, decided—as it was within the limits of their sovereign right—to carry out their long projected change, and invite Maximilian, Archduke of Austria, a descendant of the very same Charles the Fifth who formerly ruled over the country, to become Emperor. He accepted the invitation, entered Mexico in 1864, and has now been ruler of the country longer than any Mexican administration, save one. He has

proved to be an enlightened and an able man, of liberal and progressive ideas, fully competent to wear the crown. All the central States and large cities acknowledge his authority (see table of population, pp. 22–3); all the merchants and leading men desire to see his throne become permanent, and all admit that his government is far better than any that ever preceded it in Mexico. If he succeeds, order will reign again; if he should be driven out, anarchy, worse than ever, will prevail, because the Republican Generals have lost their influence, their troops and their revenues. Even now, in the presence of what they choose to call usurpation, they are battling one another. Juarez, of his own accord, has extended the time of his administration, against the very letter of the Constitution which he claims as a guide. Ortega, in the North, has raised the standard of revolt, proclaiming himself the legitimate President. Each of these leaders has his followers, and it is but logical to presume that, were they once alone, blood and carnage would follow.

THE AMERICAN THREAT OF INTERVENTION.

The chief obstacle in the way of Maximilian is the conduct of the American Union, which refuses to recognize him, and threatens to expel him. Many of the Mexicans, fearful that the Empire will be overthrown by the policy of the United States, refuse to commit themselves to it, and the banditti,* who claim the name of Republicans, can continue their work of pillage and murder. The moment that the United States recognizes Maximilian, that moment the Juarists will lose half their force, moral as well as physical; the people will at once accept the Imperial authority, the Imperial army will advance with more spirit: the Imperial funds will rise ten, twenty or thirty per cent. and Mexico will soon have the form of government which she should have retained when it was given to her by Iturbide, and to which the masses of the people, as we must admit, are alone adapted, *their social and moral decay precluding the possibility* of the success of any other.

*The appellation of banditti is justly and properly used. What other name can be given to a Cortinas, whose punishment, but a few years ago, was demanded from Mexico by us, for the cold and bloody murder of American citizens, and whom every paper in our country denounced in most emphatic language?

We are told that as we are the leading Republic of the world, so it is our duty to defend the cause of republicanism against monarchy. That doctrine implies that we must be ready at all times to engage in war, that we must make it our policy to meddle in the domestic affairs of other nations. When we once formally avow that policy, we necessarily become the guardian and ally, not only of all Republican parties, but of all democratic revolutions and rebellions, so that the enemies of peace and order will be secure of our protection so soon as they hoist the flag or avow the pretense of Republicanism. Then we should encourage and foment rebellion and anarchy. If we consider it a duty to maintain democratic forms where hitherto established, we should also, as a logical consequence, undertake to overthrow monarchy, where it exists peacefully, and introduce Republicanism. We might assume that a large portion of the people of every civilized nation would prefer free institutions, and this assumption would furnish a pretext when we have once adopted the policy of intervention. If we should overthow the authority of Maximilian in Mexico, why should we not do as much for that of Victoria in Canada? The Canadian has as many rights as the Mexican, is as near to us in geographical position, nearer in blood and language, more assimilated to our people, and in every way has as much claim on our sympathy and assistance. Cuba and Brazil, also portions of the New World, are likewise subject to monarchical authority, from which we might liberate them. But why should distance limit our duties, or why should the western hemisphere have stronger claims upon our coöperation than the eastern? Ireland, France and Germany are nearer to us than Chile or Peru. If we should declare that it is our policy to intervene in favor of Republicanism, we would soon be taught to stay at home and mind our own affairs. History is full of lessons for those that feel like meddling in foreign quarrels. But even if intervention were proper, we should intervene with the right, for order, industry, commerce and stable government, not for anarchy, retrocession and barbarism.

MONROE DOCTRINE.

Again, it is said that we are pledged by the Monroe Doc-

trine to interfere. Mr. Monroe said our Government would consider any European intervention, for the purpose of oppressing the Spanish American Republics, or of controlling their destiny, as the manifestation of an unfriendly disposition to the United States; and would consider any attempt on the part of Allied Powers to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety. This declaration was made just after those Republics had attained their independence, and when the most sanguine hopes were entertained of their ability to maintain Republican Government. It is evident that the words "to extend their system to this hemisphere," were mainly intended to convey the idea that any extension of dominion by conquest would be considered as such-for surely Mr. Monroe never could have experienced a fear for the stability of our institutions if brought into contact with a monarchical government.

In Mexico there is no conquest; the sovereignty and nationality are preserved, therefore the doctrine of Mr. Monroe is not violated. But it never was the intention of Mr. Monroe to pledge the Government of the United States to any course of action in future contingencies. The matter was discussed in the United States Senate, and the idea that the country was pledged to intervention on behalf of Republicanism was energetically repudiated by such leading men as Levi Woodbury, Hugh L. White, John M. Berrien and Martin Van Buren and was not sustained by anybody of note.* If, however, any foolish promise had been given in the past, it is not too late now to revoke it. Circumstances have changed between 1823 and 1866. The Mexican Republic is no longer a hopeful thing of the future, but a hopeless thing of the past. It has been tried and found wanting. In 1823, the sympathies of the friends of liberty throughout the world were with it; in 1866, the sympathies of all the friends of order are against it. It has proved itself to be not only a complete failure, but a terrible scourge. The history of the civilized world may be hunted through in vain for a parallel to the forty years of Republican misrule in Mexico. A new administration every

* An interesting report of this debate will be found in Benton's Abridgment, Vol. VIII, page 434.

year, and a new Constitution every alternate year, all based on usurpation, and each worse, it may be said, in general terms, than the one which preceded it. Is that the kind of Republicanism that we favor, for which we are to meddle in a foreign quarrel? Is that the system which we recommend to other nations? Is that the legitimate result of Federal Republicanism?

REPUBLICANISM A MEANS, NOT AN END.

No; the American people desire the success of Republicanism only among those people who are fitted for it, not because it is Republicanism, but because we regard it as the form that, after a certain condition has been reached, is the most favorable to education, trade, the formation of manly character, and the security of the rights of the people. We care little about the means, much about the end. Republicanism in Mexico has failed to attain the desired end, and therefore we must wish for the success of another system that will give the people there the blessings of which they are most in need—that is: peace and security of life and property. With us the people form the Government; but in Mexico it is the *latter* which must form the people.

THE OPINION OF THE AMERICAN GOVERNMENT.

The opinion of the Government of the United States in regard to the condition of our southern neighbor was thus expressed by James Buchanan, President of the United States, in his message at the opening of Congress, in 1858:

"Mexico has been in a state of constant revolution almost ever since it achieved its independence. One military leader after another has usurped the Government in rapid succession, and the various Constitutions, from time to time adopted, have been set at nought almost as soon as proclaimed. The successive Governments have afforded no adequate protection, either to Mexican citizens or foreign residents, against lawless violence. Heretofore the seizure of the capital by a military chieftain has been generally followed by at least the nominal submission of the country to his rule for a brief period; but not so at the present crisis of Mexican affairs.

* * * This country, blessed with a productive soil and a benign climate, has been reduced by civil dissension to a condition of almost hopeless anarchy and imbecility." (Message and Documents, 1858–59, Vol. I, p. 16.)

Are we now to stultify ourselves before the world by endeavoring to reëstablish "*hopeless anarchy and imbecility*" in the place of order and progress, and that at the risk of our own ruin?

MAXIMILIAN THE CHOICE OF MEXICO.

But it is said that Maximilian is not the choice of the people, and that he did not get the crown in the right way. So far as the choice is concerned, the Mexicans have elected him as fairly as they ever elected anybody; and since he has taken the throne nearly nine-tenths of the people have submitted to him, and all peaceful citizens desire the permanence of his dominion. This is no vain assertion, but the simple truth, manifested by the numerous adhesions of the principal leading men of the ex-Republican government, such as General Uraga, Vidaurri, Mendoza, Ampudia, Camaño, O'Horan, Quiroga, and twenty other Generals that could be named; ex-Minister Payno, ex-Chief Justice Ruiz, together with hundreds of other civilians of minor importance, whose adhesions are registered in the official journals.

The following statistics of what were once States and Territories under the Republic will fully confirm the correctness of our estimate, and though we have assigned one-third of the population of those occupied by both parties to the Liberals, it is a well known fact that the Imperialists hold the principal cities and towns, whilst the former wander or rest mainly in the mountain fastnesses and villages of little or no importance, and therefore the allowance is large:

STATES OCCUPIED BY BOTH PARTIES.

Coahuila	67,000
Nuevo Leon	145.000
Tamaulipas	108.000
Michoacan	481.000
Vera Cruz	338.000
Tabasco	63.000
Tehuantepec	80,000
Sonora	140,000
Total	1,422,000

STATES OCCUPIED SOLELY BY THE EMPIRE.

San Luis Potosi	390,000
Zacatecas	303,000
Aguas Calientes	86,000
Durango	156,000
Jalisco	805,000
Guanajuato	874,000
Queretaro	280,000
Puebla	657,000
Oaxaca	531,000
Yucatan and Campeche	680,000
Colima	65,000
Tiascala	80,000
Sierra Gorda	55,000
Isla del Carmen	12,000
Distrito de Mexico	369,000
Mexico (State)	1,012,000
Total population	6,355,000

STATES OCCUPIED MOSTLY BY LIBERAL FORCES.

Chihuahua	160,000
Sinaloa	156,000
Guerrero	212,000
Chiapas	148,000
Baja California	12,000
Total	688,000
Add to the total population of the States solely occupied by the Empire, viz	6,355,000
Two-thirds of the population of States occupied by both parties	948,000
Gives total population under the Empire	7,303,000
Total population under the Republic	1,162,000

The population of the different States and Territories, as given above, was ascertained by the census of 1862. The population of the Departments into which the country has been divided, would show a still larger proportion in favor of the Empire, but we are willing to make the calculation on the Liberal basis. In the classification of the States we have, also, made the estimates in the manner most favorable for the Liberals. For instance, in the States of Sinaloa, Chihuahua and Guerrero the most important places are in the possession of the Imperial forces, nevertheless we allow the Liberals all that they can claim on that special point.

Be it observed that in most of the country there are a number, more or less, of roving banditti who obey no law, and cannot or ought not with justice be entitled to the name of

Liberals; they plunder one another, as well as enemies and friends.

EMPEROR MAXIMILIAN IS FAIRLY ELECTED.

As to the manner in which Maximilian got the crown, no fault can be found by anybody save an advocate of anarchy. In a country where there is no public opinion, where the masses of the people have no voice, but a total disregard and repugnance for matters appertaining to the Government, and have lost all sense of national pride and principle, it was impossible that a monarchy could be established and a monarch chosen with more fairness, with more regard for the popular wishes or interests, with less selfishness on the part of those who had control of the country at the time the change was made. But even if there had been gross disregard of popular wishes, and usurpation of the throne by mere military force, *Maximilian would be no worse than the Mexican Presidents.* The question is now not whether he got the crown according to some worthless formality, but whether he is fit to wear it. On that latter point, we answer emphatically in the affirmative. And even if he were personally an ignorant, mean tyrant, we are still disposed to believe that in *the present condition of Mexico the worst man as monarch is better than the best as President.* Order is the first requisite for human society.

SHALL WE EXPEL HIM BY FORCE?

There are even some men so silly and foolish as to desire that we should take up arms against him. The force of folly could not go farther. We have nothing to gain and everything to lose by such a course. We should be trying to impoverish still more a country whose present poverty is to us a national misfortune. We would be fighting for vandalism against order, for barbarism against civilization—in fact, we would be the main champions in an attack on the welfare of the human family.

In a war with Mexico, although Maximilian is powerless to attack us, he is powerful to defend himself. We should have to be the aggressors. We should have to invade Mexico. The assailant is always at a disadvantage, which increases

every year with the improvement in arms and fortifications. Our transportation alone would cost hundreds of millions. Maximilian would fight at home, in self defence, behind breastworks, with all the inner lines of communication; we should be abroad, aggressors in the open field, with no convenient communication. We should find no Mississippi to transport our gunboats, no railroads to carry supplies, no telegraphs to convey messages, no negroes to give information. Our army would not promenade through Mexico as it did twenty years ago. We should have to face Mexicans, Frenchmen, Austrians and ex-Rebels—officers and soldiers as well trained and as well armed as our own. But if we are the aggressors on land, Maximilian would become the aggressor at sea. His privateers would swarm from his ports on both oceans, and American commerce would have another experience like that from 1861 to 1865, but perhaps still more disastrous to us. We could not take all the ports of Mexico. California would be the chief sufferer. Our steamer lines would be cut off, our commerce interrupted, and the price of all our imports doubled, while the shipment of our treasure would cost three times as much. The annual loss of our State alone by the increased value of imports, and the decreased value of exports would probably be not less than $15,000,000.

MEXICO WILL NOT FIGHT ALONE.

But we have no right to assume, and no reason to believe, that we should have to deal with Maximilian alone. The French troops in Mexico are in the French service, and under the French flag. If we attack Maximilian we attack them, and if we attack them we attack France. But what right have we to attack her? She has not broken any treaty with us; she has not violated any principle of international law to our detriment; she has not injured any of our citizens, or taken or damaged any of our property. But, say the advocates of war, she has violated the Monroe Doctrine. And if she has, what of it? When did she promise to observe it? Have we the authority to dictate to France how she shall transact her business with Mexico, especially when we see that she undertakes no conquest, but endeavors only to establish an

orderly and respectable government at very considerable risk and expense to herself? An administration that provokes a war with France is unfit to rule over a civilized nation. Under provocation, her people will stand by the Government, whatever it may be, and woe be to the nation that assails the French united in defence of their honor and rights. They are then invincible, as all good men must wish that they should be. A long struggle with such a great military and naval power means commercial, financial and political ruin. We might have the mean satisfaction of dragging our enemy down with us—the French nation, and the very people who enabled us to gain our independence, and to whom we are indirectly indebted for all our power and all our prosperity. If any American can take pleasure in the contemplation of such a result, we are not proud of being his countrymen.

But it is said the French will withdraw from Mexico in November, 1867, and then we can expel Maximilian without involving ourselves in war with any European power. That assumption is by no means a safe one. Napoleon is the guardian of Maximilian, and withdraws, as he says, in the expectation that the United States will not molest the Mexican Empire. He does not threaten war in case we interfere—he is too wise for that; but we can scarcely mistake his meaning. He must defend Maximilian against any foreign agression. He has loaned the money of the French Government, and induced the French people to lend theirs, to the Mexican Empire. He has guaranteed one of the loans, and as the expulsion of Maximilian would be equivalent to the repudiation of that debt, he cannot with honor permit it. There are, moreover, passages in the speeches made by Maximilian when the throne was offered to him, and when he accepted the offer, which lead to the belief that there are some other formal and binding obligations. On the 3d of October, 1863, Gutierrez de Estrada, at the head of the Mexican Deputation appointed to invite him to become Emperor of Mexico, formally gave the invitation at the castle of Miramar. The Archduke, in his reply, said:

"However high and noble may be the enterprise of securing the independence and the prosperity of Mexico, under the protection of free and permanent institutions, I cannot avoid see-

ing, in complete agreement with His Majesty, the Emperor of the French, whose glorious initiative has made the regeneration of your beautiful country a possibility, that monarchy cannot be reëstablished in it unless the prayer of the capital is ratified by the whole nation, or a free manifestation of its will. Upon the result of a general vote of the country, then, in the first place, depends my acceptance of the throne offered to me.

"In the second place, comprehending the sacred duties of a sovereign, I must possess, for the Empire which is to be reconstituted, *the guaranties necessary to protect it from the dangers which might threaten its integrity and independence.*

"If these guaranties are given to secure the future, and if the choice of the noble Mexican people generally fixes itself upon my name, fortified by the consent of the august chief of my family, and with my trust in the aid of the Almighty, I will be ready to accept the crown."

On the 10th day of April, 1864, Gutierrez de Estrada, together with the other members of the Mexican Deputation, again presented himself at the palace of Miramar, with the certificates of the result of the election in Mexico, and Maximilian, in replying to his address, said:

"A careful examination of the acts of adhesion* which you

* STATISTICAL TABLE,

Showing the number of inhabitants of the different cities, towns and and villages that had given their submission to and were under the Imperial Government when the Mexican Deputation offered the crown to H. I. H. the Archduke Maximilian, in Miramar, as published in the "Diario Oficial," Mexican official journal, on the 2d of April, 1864.

No.	States and Territories.	Number of Inhabitants.
1	Vera Cruz	289,000
2	Puebla	553,000
3	Mexico State	1,292,000
4	Mexico District	
5	Guerrero (part of)	61,000
6	Queretaro	172,000
7	Guanajuato y Sierra Gorda	890,000
8	Michoacan	360,000
9	San Luis Potosi	384,000
10	Jalisco	654,000
11	Zacatecas	16,000
12	Isla del Carmen	10,000
13	Yucatan	540,000
14	Campeche	84,000
15	Tehuantepec	39,000
16	Aguas Calientes	53.000
17	Tabasco	42,000
18	Tamaulipas	9,000
19	Tlascala	76,000
	Total	5,624,000

have presented to me, convinces me that the vote of the Assembly of Notables of Mexico has been ratified, by an immense majority of your nation, and that I can with good right consider myself the choice of the Mexican people. Thus the first condition stated in my reply of the 3d of October has been complied with. At the same time I mentioned another, that of *a guaranty for the new Empire*, so that it could dedicate its energies and quiet to the noble task of establishing its independence and welfare on solid foundations. *This guaranty I now have*, thanks to the magnanimity of the Emperor of the French.

"I trust that we shall prove that true liberty is not inconsistent with the dominion of order; I will respect the former and make others respect the latter."

Thus, in his first speech he mentioned, as a second condition, the guaranties and protection from dangers that might threaten the independence and integrity of Mexico, and on his accepting the crown he clearly states that said guaranties were obtained.

Now, what are these guaranties of the independence of Mexico? Does that mean that France will protect Maximilian against any foreign foe who undertakes to overthrow the Empire merely because it is an Empire? The language will bear that interpretation.

"MANIFEST DESTINY," ANNEXATION.

There is among the American sympathizers with Juarez much of the old longing for annexation, much of the old idea that it is the manifest destiny of the American Union to govern the entire continent. If we should succeed in driving Maximilian out of Mexico, they would desire to maintain a great standing army and annex the country at once. In such a contingency we would get a bitter lesson about trying to master a people of different blood, language, laws, customs and religion, who have been accustomed for half a century to civil war. It is well known that wherever the Americans and Mexicans have met as settlers in California, New Mexico and Texas, a bitter antipathy has sprung up between them, and murders on account of race have been common. In this State there was often

danger of civil war, notwithstanding the fact that the Mexicans were in a small minority and were separated from their kindred by the Colorado desert. And yet the population of California was far better fitted for incorporation in the United States than that of Mexico now is. The Californians had a greater proportion of white blood, they were more intelligent, they were accustomed to a more orderly government, they had learned more by intercourse with foreigners, and many of the leading families were connected by marriage with Americans. Half of the Mexicans are pure-blooded Indians, over one-fourth are of mixed blood, and not one-fourth are pure white. We could not maintain order with manhood suffrage among the Indians, and we could not govern them under our system otherwise. The annexation of Mexico would be a blunder, and God only knows but it might be the first step that would lead us to national wreck. Our Government in Mexico could be nothing but a military despotism, which would meet with the opposition of the truly patriotic Mexicans who still retain but too vividly in their memory the remembrance of the past events that led to the loss of half their territory. Although some of what are called Liberals clamor to us now for aid, the greater part of them still nourish a bitter resentment and hatred against us.

AMERICAN INTERESTS DEMAND RECOGNITION OF THE EMPIRE.

Every consideration that should influence a good and enlightened man in our day is in favor of Maximilian. His throne is the shield of order against anarchy, of liberty against lawless tyranny, of progress against barbarism, of national character and independence against separation and destruction. He is not a Mexican by birth, but no native of the country could succeed better in his place. He has naturalized himself; he has pledged himself to maintain the integrity of the country and to govern in the *interest* of Mexico; he relies in his administration chiefly on Mexicans; and he proclaims his intention to dismiss all his foreign allies so soon as order is securely reëstablished. Although the clergy labored actively to place him on the throne, he refused to let them dictate to him He has confirmed the sale of the church property, made

by Juarez, and decreed religious toleration. In the matter of public improvements, more has been done by him already than under any five previous administrations. By an annual subsidy of $85,000, assigned to B. Holladay, he maintains monthly steam communication each way between San Francisco and Mazatlan, touching at Guaymas. He employs an American steamer which now plies regularly between Mazatlan and Acapulco, touching at all the principal intermediate ports. He pays a subsidy to an American steamer line between Vera Cruz and New York, and another line between St. Nazaire and Vera Cruz also receives a subsidy. He has granted to Charles Arnoux, as the representative of a company of New York capitalists, the exclusive privilege for fifteen years of maintaining a telegraphic line between the City of Mexico and San Francisco, by way of Guadalajara, San Blas, Mazatlan, Guaymas and Lower California, with a branch extending across from Mazatlan, through Durango, to Camargo. To another company he has granted a franchise for a telegraphic line between Guanajuato and Matamoras, by way of Saltillo and Monterey. A second line has been constructed between the capital and Vera Cruz ; a line has been opened between Cuernavaca and Mexico ; and another between Tehuacan and Oajaca has been carried almost to completion. Under the Republic twenty miles of railway were completed ; under the Empire nearly a hundred have been finished already. The roads between Mexico and Vera Cruz, and between Tlascala and Puebla are rapidly advancing ; and preparations are being made for commencing to grade the lines between Mexico and Queretaro, between Mexico and Cuatitlan, and between Tehuacan and Oajaca. A bank has been established in the capital. Numerous financial, industrial and scientific enterprises have been projected far too numerous indeed to be enumerated here, as a natural result of the general confidence in the restoration of order. Among those who have received grants and franchises are a number of Americans from the Northern States, showing the desire of the Emperor to live upon friendly terms with us.

All our reasonable hopes for the establishment of a stable government on the southern border, for the development of the

resources of Mexico, for the growth of trade and commerce, for the building of railways and telegraph lines to connect the regions in the torrid with those in the temperate and frigid zones—all are bound up with the success of Maximilian. If he succeeds we can expect that progress will be the law of Mexico. Schools will be established, popular education will become a fact, industrious habits will be formed, communication between the seaports and the interior will be speedy and cheap, brigandism will be suppressed, life and property will become secure; the silver mines of the Sierra Madre will double or treble their annual production; our traffic with Mexico will increase ten-fold, and we shall have a neighbor that we can admire and respect. These results may be more or less slow in coming, but come they must, and they will come the quicker the more encouragement and assistance Maximilian receives from those whose duty it is to assist and encourage him. The prosperity of the new Empire will be our prosperity. With a border line a thousand miles long, and neighboring seaports on two oceans, with industry and productions to supply all the wants of *progressive Mexico*, we shall derive far more profit relatively than any other nation from its advancement. San Francisco and New York can gain much by peace with Maximilian, and nothing by war. Their commerce, their manufactures, their shipping, all demand the maintenance of order and the encouragement of peaceful industry throughout the world.

Notwithstanding the terrible struggle through which we have lately passed, our people have not yet got a proper estimate of the evils of war. War means the arrest of national growth, the increase of taxation, the multiplication of tax-gatherers, the establishment and perpetuation of odious inquisitions into private business, the enlargement of the standing army, the elevation of the military above the civil authority, the shielding of soldiers from punishmnnt for crime, the postponement of a return to a specie currency, the fluctuation of greenbacks, great and sudden changes in business, the insecurity of all branches of trade, the bankruptcy of many, the amassing of princely fortunes by a few, the general impoverishment of the poorer classes, the widening of the gap between the rich and the poor, the slaughter of the healthy young men

and the increase of widows, orphans, cripples and puny men. These are the results of long wars, carried on abroad ; when the tide turns and war visits us at home, horrors too numerous and too fearful to be written accompany it. And yet, if we wantonly and unnecessarily carry war into the territory of our neighbors, shall we expect always to escape? That is not the course of human destiny!

TO PEACE WE OWE OUR SUCCESS.

It is to peace and our peaceful policy that we owe our greatness. The emigrant has come to our shores confident that here he would not be drafted into the army and slaughtered in some foolish quarrel which would end, as nearly all wars have ended, by injuring both parties without benefit to anybody save contractors and generals. He has come, confident that he would not be taxed to death to sustain a standing army, and that his property would not be destroyed by a foreign invader. Our commerce has grown in the expectation that our ships would not be exposed to capture. Our Government has been consolidated by the superiority of the civil to the military authorities. Industry and the wealth of the country have advanced with unexampled rapidity, partly because there was no large standing army to encourage idleness and to feed a great multitude of idlers at the expense of the laboring classes.

We are so powerful that we can almost certainly remain at peace if we desire it; and we should desire it, and proclaim our desire to all the world. If we intend to invite emigrants to come, if we expect to induce our own people to stay, if we wish to encourage the investment of capital and the establishment of new industrial enterprises, we should declare in the most emphatic and public manner that our policy is peaceful and that we shall never resort to arms, except in some worthy cause and in self defense.

No matter how much the majority of the voters of the United States might demand an aggressive war, no administration could safely enter into one, if there was a prospect that it would last four or five years. The American people do not consider themselves bound by elections. The fact that they voted for war in one year would not prevent them from voting against it the next year. An absolute monarch like Napoleon,

or an oligarchy like that of England, can carry on war for ten or fifteen years and remain firm in purpose; but the case is different with a democracy, where the majority are in danger of the draft and have to quarrel with the tax gatherer for their last dollar. Notwithstanding the tremendous popular enthusiasm which signalized the beginning of the war for the defense of our Union, the elections in the leading States of New York and Pennsylvania, a year later, were against the Administration, and to a considerable extent against the war, and but for the fortunate turn in the tide of success in the midsummer of 1863, the election of the fall would have been in favor of the recognition of the rebels. In 1864 we had numerous riots on account of the draft, frequent cases of resistance to the tax-gatherers, and at the Presidential election of 1864 forty-five voters out of every one hundred were in favor of McClellan and a surrender to the rebels of every point in controversy save the unity of our territory. If, in such a sacred cause, the people were on the verge of abandoning the contest, how could an Administration place confidence in their firmness to maintain a useless and a wanton war? Our men are too good to be slaughtered in war, and they are accustomed to modes of living so luxurious that they will not be satisfied with the privations of the camp. Besides, our armies have a public conscience. They want to know that they are right, that they are fighting for some sacred principle, that if their blood is shed, it will be for the benefit of mankind. Our men are too intelligent to be deceived, and too sensitive to the sympathies of humanity to feel like fighting heartily in a cause which their own judgment repudiates, and which they know would be condemned in the history of the world.

The only proper and safe policy for nations is that which should govern individuals—that is a strict regard to duty, a careful consideration of the rights, circumstances and feelings of others, a studious attention to our business, abstinence from meddling in the affairs of others, modest and polite demeanor even towards enemies, and a love of peace for its own sake. The nation, like the person, whose conduct is guided by this policy, always commands respect and affection, while any other course causes fear and dislike, and hostility that may lead to trouble. I trust that my country will be wise and good enough to follow the paths of PEACE.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
0 015 833 247 4